



(c) 1988 Chicago Tribune, June 15, 1988

Institute, a nonprofit group that advises employers on how to adopt antismoking policies.

"Half the businesses in the country have some type of policy, and they're getting stronger," he said.

TERMS: REACTION; INDUSTRY; COURT; DECISION; LAWSUIT; LAW STATISTIC; COST;
FINANCE

2022875425

LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®] LEXIS[®] NEXIS[®]



(c) 1988 Chicago Tribune, June 15, 1988

Just such unclear advertising will give impetus to congressional efforts to restrict ads, said Rep. Thomas Luken (D, Ohio). Bills that would ban advertising and promotion of cigarettes, limit them to the tombstone format used in financial ads or create a "fairness doctrine" for print media that accept cigarette ads are pending before the House Energy and Commerce Committee's Subcommittee on Hazardous Materials.

Luken, who heads that subcommittee, also has introduced a bill that would substantially alter the cigarette labeling act of 1966.

That law required the hazardous warning label on every package of cigarettes and on all cigarette ads. In 1971, the law was expanded to ban all ads from the public airways.

Luken's proposal "won't ban advertising, but it will hit them where it hurts. It would make them liable for any false and misleading advertising" used after 1966, he said.

The law limited the Cipollone case to pre-1966 advertising, Luken said. He said such current ads as the "lowest tar" ones, for example, could be interpreted to imply that some cigarettes are safer than others.

Sen. Bill Bradley (D., N.J.) is sponsoring a bill that would eliminate cigarette advertising as a business tax deduction. If passed, the bill could cost the industry as much as \$1 billion per year.

The cigarette industry, which spent \$2.38 billion on ads and promotion in 1986, including \$119 million on newspaper advertising, downplayed the escalating threats.

"We have no contingency plans for the ending of advertising," said David Fischel, a spokesman for RJR Nabisco. "Our ads are intended for competitive switching. If you prohibit ads, it hurts the consumer. How will they learn about new products?"

Wall Street analysts could see a silver lining in the smokeless clouds being blown over the tobacco industry by its opponents. "A complete advertising ban would be wonderful," said Roy D. Burry, analyst at Kidder Peabody. "It would save them 25 percent of their pre-tax earnings. It's a method of competition between companies that won't affect total demand."

John Banzhaf, executive director of Action on Smoking and Health and a law professor at George Washington University, said that the documentation that came out of the case is persuading many legislators to support more antismoking measures. Forty-one states have passed smoking restrictions, and 12 restrict smoking in private workplaces.

The number of jurisdictions with antismoking laws is growing rapidly. Chicago and New York recently passed stringent antismoking measures, though Illinois rejected such a move.

The antismoking movement in the workplace also is picking up steam. The last two surgeon general reports on smoking, which branded the habit as addictive and said it threatened nonsmokers who breathed smoke-filled air, have turned the tide, said Robert A. Rosner, executive director of the Smoking Policy

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875424



LEVEL 1 - 19 OF 55 STORIES

Copyright (c) 1988 Chicago Tribune Company;
Chicago Tribune

June 15, 1988, Wednesday, SPORTS FINAL EDITION

SECTION: BUSINESS; Pg. 1; ZONE: C

LENGTH: 927 words

HEADLINE: COURT RULING HEATS UP SMOKING WAR

BODY:

Tobacco industry forces on Tuesday dismissed claims that a court decision blaming a cigarette manufacturer for a woman's premature death marked a turning point in the industry's continuing battle against more regulation.

The industry, inured by a quarter century of negative publicity that began with the requirement to include health warnings on its products, quickly launched an offensive against further legislative and legal onslaughts.

At a New York City press conference, industry lawyers attacked the impartiality of the judge in the four-month trial and argued that greed drove the attorneys who had sued the \$35 billion a year industry.

But antismoking activists plotted their own strategy, including seeking further limitations on cigarette advertising and promotion; establishing more laws banning smoking in public places and more restrictions on smoking at work; and bringing more suits against the tobacco industry.

The posturing by both sides was prompted by a decision Monday by a federal jury in Newark, N.J., who said the Liggett Group had misled the public into thinking cigarette smoking was safe in its pre-1966 advertising for its L&M and Chesterfield brands. The jury awarded \$400,000 to Antonio Cipollone, whose 58-year-old wife, Rose, died in 1986 of lung cancer.

Wall Street had its own opinion of the decision. Tobacco stocks plunged Tuesday, with Liggett Group falling 50 cents a share to \$7.62; Philip Morris Cos. Inc., the nation's biggest tobacco company, falling \$1.75 to \$83.25; Loews Corp., parent of Lorillard, slipping 25 cents to \$65.12; and RJR Nabisco Inc. dropping \$1 to \$47.

The stock market's short-term chest X-ray of the tobacco industry is in line with the long-term prognosis from the antismoking movement.

"The decision is another step toward the demise of cigarette smoking as acceptable behavior," said Elizabeth M. Whelan, executive director of the American Council on Science and Health. "It was bad news for the credibility of the cigarette industry, which is practically nil anyway."

The Cipollone case hinged on the ad slogans used by Liggett in the late 1950s. The company's ads claimed smoking L&Ms was "just what the doctor ordered." Chesterfield smokers were advised to "play safe, don't change."

In a deposition taken before her death, Mrs. Cipollone said that "through advertising, I was led to assume they were safe and they wouldn't harm me."

LEXIS NEXIS LEXIS NEXIS

2022875423